

REMARKS

Please enter
MSW
6/15/04

As a preliminary matter, Applicants' undersigned attorney wishes to thank

Examiner Walling and Supervisory Patent Examiner Barlow for extending the courtesy of a telephone interview conducted on May 19, 2004. The interview focused on independent claim 1 and dependent claims 3-5, 7 and 8, particularly with respect to the Boesch, Eckelt and Okawa references cited by the Examiner in the final Office Action.

This Response is submitted under Rule 116 in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicants' invention as discussed with the Examiners during the interview and to place this application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the above Amendments. In view of the interview, the above Amendments and the Remarks which follow, reconsideration and early allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16-35 and 39 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 13, 16-35 and 39 are allowed. Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 8 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the reasons stated on pages 2-6 of the Office Action. Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 4 herein and have rewritten claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claims 3 and 4. No new matter has been introduced.

During the telephone interview conducted with the Examiners, Applicants' undersigned attorney presented arguments to establish that the cited Boesch, Eckelt and Okawa references, whether taken alone or combined, do not teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed in the rejected claims. Particularly, it was argued that the "displacement" calculated according to Boesch is essentially an integral of velocity values over time, and by calculating tire pressure from a computed velocity value, Boesch introduces inaccuracies which are avoided by